

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 2, 9, and 16 have been canceled. Upon entrance of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 will be pending. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,003,280 to Pelaez et al. (Pelaez) and U.S. Patent No. 7,006,508 to Bondy et al. (Bondy) further in view of U.S. Patent App. Publication No. 2003/0053434 to Chow et al. (Chow). The Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a comprehensive service node comprising a signaling interface, a storage system, and a processing system. The signaling interface is adapted for transmitting and receiving signaling communications between a communication network and a communication device, wherein the communication device is operated by a user. Generally, the storage system is configured to store a number of different signaling routines and an enable/disable system. The processing system is configured, in part, to receive a configuration command, with the configuration command specifying an enable or disable operation for one or more of the signaling routines, wherein the user determines the enable or disable operation for one or more of the specified signaling routines and perform the configuration operation of the configuration command, wherein the configuration operation enables or disables the one or more specified signaling routines.

Pelaez discloses a multimedia telecommunications network 10 that provides users the ability to transmit and receive multimedia communications and access to data networks. (Pelaez, col. 3, lines 56-65). Multimedia telecommunications network 10 comprises, in part, IP multimedia subsystem (IMS) 20. IMS 20 includes, among other system elements, call session control function (CSCF) 22, multimedia resource function processor (MRFP) 30, multimedia resource function controller (MRFC) 32, and home subscriber server (HSS) 34. (Pelaez, col. 4, lines 1-19).

However, Pelaez fails to disclose a processing system configured to receive a configuration command, with the configuration command specifying an enable or disable

operation for one or more of the signaling routines, *wherein the user determines the enable or disable operation for one or more of the specified signaling routines*. Instead, in Pelaez the user is able to decide whether or not an incoming call should be connected to the user's mobile device, and if the user decides to connect the call, the user selects the call quality and/or type. (Pelaez, col. 8, line 60 – col. 9, line 14). Essentially, the user is adjusting the amount of bandwidth that will be allotted to the call; thus, the user may choose to “save” airtime by reducing the quality of the call and by changing the type of call received. (Pelaez, col. 9, lines 14-21). A user determining whether or not to accept an incoming call and determining the call quality or type is not the same as a user determining to enable or disable one or more signaling routines, as set forth in claim 1.

Furthermore, in the 09-26-2008 Office action, HSS 34 of Pelaez is equated to the storage system of claim 1. (09-26-2008 Office Action, pg. 3, line 6). However, Pelaez discloses that HSS 34 stores “subscriber profile information, . . . such as user identification, user security information, including network access control information for authentication and authorization, user location information for user registration and locating, and user profiles, including identification of the services subscribed to and other service specific information.” (Pelaez, col. 6, lines 1-10). Claim 1 recites that the storage system stores the various signaling routines and the enable/disable routine. Storing subscriber profile information is not the same as storing various signaling routines and the enable/disable routine, as set forth in claim 1.

Additionally, MRFP 30, CSCF 22, and MRFC 32 of Pelaez are equated to the processing system of claim 1. (09-26-2008 Office Action, pg. 3, lines 11-12). CSCF 22 controls MRFP 30 via MRFC 32 in order to support conferencing and other multi-party services. (Pelaez, col. 5, lines 24-30). Additionally, it is well known that a media resource function controller and processor work together to provide media related functions such as media manipulation and playing of tones and announcements, and are not a processing system that process the signaling information with the signaling routines, as set forth in claim 1.

Bondy discloses a communication network for providing communication surveillance of communications between a first party and a second party by sending duplicate bearer packets of the data packets carrying the communicated data between the

parties to a law enforcement agency. (Bondy, col. 3, lines 8-29). In the 09-26-2008 Office action, the activation/deactivation of data streams in Bondy is equated to the configuration operation enabling or disabling one of more of the specified signaling routines. (09-26-2008 Office Action, pg. 4, lines 8-9). However, the activation disclosed in Bondy merely applies to the capability to generate duplicate bearer streams of a targeted subscriber's communications to a law enforcement agency. (Bondy, col. 4, lines 42-46; col. 5, line 51 – col. 6, line 9). Therefore, Bondy fails to disclose performing the configuration operation of the configuration command, wherein the configuration operation enables or disables the one or more specified signaling routines, as set forth in claim 1.

Additionally, Bondy fails to disclose a processing system configured to receive a configuration command, with the configuration command specifying an enable or disable operation for one or more of the signaling routines, *wherein the user determines the enable or disable operation for one or more of the specified signaling routines*. Instead, the only user decision disclosed in Bondy is whether or not to generate a duplicate bearer stream of a targeted subscriber's communications to a law enforcement agency.

Additionally, Chow fails to disclose any of the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above with regards to Pelaez and Bondy.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant asserts that Pelaez, Bondy, and Chow fail to teach all of the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable and such indication is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1 and, therefore, are respectfully considered allowable over the prior art of record for similar reasons as discussed above. Additionally, the Applicant refrains from discussion of dependent claims 3-7, 10-14, and 17-21 in view of their dependence from otherwise allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Included herewith is payment for the appropriate fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(1) for a one-month extension of time (37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)). The Applicant believes no additional fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 21-0765 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin D. Robb/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Kevin D. Robb, Reg. No. 47,901
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Steven J. Funk
Sprint
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100